



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ceived from many members of the Society. A large share of the success which the past year commemorates, the Council feel to be due to the harmony of thought and action which exists between the responsible and irresponsible members; and, should the general meeting think fit to approve our efforts on this our second anniversary, we may confidently promise a continued prosperity and a prouder position for the Society at its next general meeting.

Signed on behalf of the Council,

JAMES HUNT, *Chairman*.

Mr. R. LEE moved—"That the Report of Council be adopted." He said that he had heard with great pleasure that portion of the report read which treated of the failure of the attempt to amalgamate the Ethnological and Anthropological Societies. He thought that we should congratulate ourselves exceedingly on this failure, as if carried into effect, the proposed amalgamated Society would have been composed of two discrepant elements, and would have united a young and vigorous Society with one that showed no signs of life or animation. Looking forward to the next meeting of the British Association, he thought that every member should unite to use the best influence at their disposal with the General Committee, to induce that body to give that proper recognition to anthropological science, on which the future prosperity of the Society must depend.

The motion was seconded by Lieut. FIREBRACE, R.E., and unanimously adopted.

The PRESIDENT appointed the Rev. F. W. Farrar, M.A., and George F. Rolph, Esq., to be scrutineers for the annual ballot.

Mr. BOLLAERT moved, and Mr. BEAVAN seconded,—“That the thanks of the Society be given to the retiring members of Council—Sir Charles Nicholson, Bart., V.P., the Duke of Roussillon, V.P., and Professor G. W. Leitner, for their services during the past year.” Carried unanimously.

Mr. J. SMITH moved, and Mr. A. RAMSAY, jun., seconded—"That the thanks of the Society be given to the President, Vice-President, officers, and Council, for their services during the past year." Carried unanimously.

Dr. Hunt, Mr. J. F. Collingwood, Mr. Bollaert (on behalf of the Council) and Mr. Carter Blake, briefly responded.

Mr. BENDYSHE moved, and Mr. DIBLEY seconded, that the thanks of the Society be given to the Auditors.

The PRESIDENT then delivered the Annual Address.

### *The President's Address.*

GENTLEMEN,—We are met this day to celebrate our second anniversary; and it may, perhaps, be useful if we take this opportunity of glancing at our labours during the past year, with a view of appreciating what yet remains for us to do. It is not for me to give any opinion as to the value of what we have done, or how far our labours have contributed to advance the cause of truth and science. I shall confine myself to a narration of undisputed facts respecting our past

work and the present state of the Society, and shall conclude with some general observations respecting the future development of anthropological science in this country.

The Fellows are well aware of all that has been published under the auspices of the Society; but they are not so well acquainted with the enormous labours which have devolved on the officers and council in order to place the Society in a permanent and satisfactory working order. Although our Society is still in its infancy, this has, to a great extent, been already accomplished. Twelve months ago, the plan of our Society was scarcely understood by many of the fellows; but during the past year it has gradually unfolded itself, and we now only await the issue of the first volume of our *Memoirs* to fully realise all the objects contemplated. During the past year it has been an especial object to set the Society on a permanently satisfactory footing, and this has been accomplished to a great extent, and without at all interfering with our present work. Although the first year's existence of the Society was one of great anxiety and labour, the second year has, therefore, required equal care and attention. Only one of the objects contemplated by the Society has hitherto proved a failure, namely, the appointment of committees to report on various subjects. None of these committees have as yet sent in any report. This may, however, be to a great extent explained by the fact that it is only recently we have had convenience for the meeting of such committees, and, under altered circumstances during the present year, the result may be very different.

At our last, or first anniversary, but little had been done for the establishment of a Museum and Library; but during the past year we have secured some very suitable apartments, and our Library promises to become most useful to the students of our science. Our Museum also progresses; but we require to establish more intimate relations with our foreign local secretaries before we can have a Museum worthy of the Society and of anthropological science.

Until a few months ago, the whole work of the Society devolved upon the honorary officers, and an enormous amount of work and attention was given by them. And here let me congratulate the Society on having been able to secure the entire services of Mr. C. Carter Blake for the Anthropological Society. I think it alike fortunate for the Society and for that gentleman that he is thus enabled to consecrate his powers to such a noble science as our Society represents. It is not sufficiently known how much time and labour Mr. J. Frederick Collingwood has given to his official duties, and how greatly the Society is his debtor for the success which has attended it. There have been periods in the Society's history, brief as it is, when the moral courage, combined with great discretion, which that gentleman so eminently possesses, has been of the greatest service. Nor must I omit to mention in this place the important and arduous labours of our treasurer, Dr. Charnock. If there has been any proposal which would benefit the Society, he has always supported it, while by exercising a judicious caution on subjects of less moment, he

has been enabled to present to you the favourable account of our finances which you have just heard. If I do not allude to other members of the Society individually, it is not because I am unconscious of the services which they have rendered; but that an opportunity has rarely presented itself to me of publicly testifying how much of our present success may be traced to the labours of the three officers I have named.

Having thus briefly touched on our past work and its present state, I shall proceed to make some remarks on the development of future anthropology in England, and the duties of our Society at the present juncture.

In my introductory address I dwelt with much emphasis on the necessity for a correct and definite terminology of our science, and proposed a committee to report thereon. It was, however, soon discovered that the present state of the science is not so advanced as to enable us to decide on this important subject. If we could determine what should be the terminology of our science, we should at the same time settle the most disputed points of anthropology. Such terms, therefore, as "variety," "race," "species," can only be defined as our science advances, when some general agreement may be, perhaps, arrived at respecting the meaning to be attached to them. To use the excellent metaphor of the illustrious Von Baer\*:—"Every great scientific problem is like a fortification, to which one can only approach slowly by running trenches. Generally people think at first that it is possible to take it by assault, but it very soon becomes clear that it is not the real thing, but only the appearance of it, only the image in our mind's eye which has been understood. Let us, however, go to work and sap slowly onwards, protected by the gabions of criticism, and at last we shall, in time, slowly get nearer and see the end more clearly before us, and meanwhile have got a firm footing in the outer work. If we can never completely take the fortress by digging trenches, the reason may be, to stick to our metaphor, that nature is no craven commander who surrenders as soon as the outworks are taken."

This admirable metaphor has other applications in anthropological science, besides that of endeavouring to fix the terminology; and I would especially call Professor Huxley's attention to it.

While we must leave the great problem as to the meaning of "race" or "species" to be worked out by future researches, we shall still be doing good service if we survey the more general terms in use, and to which so much theoretical importance does not attach.

First of all, it is necessary for us to appreciate clearly the bearing and extent of our own science. After what I have before said on this subject, I should have hardly felt it necessary to dwell upon it here but for the extraordinary statements which were recently made at the meeting of

\* I have taken this from a manuscript translation, by Mr. Bendyshe, of an article on the "Ethnographico-Craniological" collection of the Imperial Academy of St. Petersburg, which appeared in the *Bulletin de la Classe Physico-Mathématique de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Pétersbourg*, tom. xvii.

the British Association. Although in my introductory address I gave it as my opinion that "it is utterly impossible for the science of man to make any progress, [in the British Association] while it takes only a second and subordinate place in Section E," I, nevertheless, was anxious not to increase the number of sections, and therefore gave notice of a motion to incorporate anthropology into that section. I did this under the impression that by uniting with others interested in a branch of our science, we might be better able to protest against the undue power which has hitherto been assumed by the geographers. The Council of our Society ordered their delegate to support the resolution, as I was prevented from attending. I hardly know whether it is a cause for regret or the reverse that this motion was not carried. When I proposed it, I was fully convinced that it could only be a temporary arrangement; and that the science of man must eventually obtain a separate section.

It was with little surprise that we learned that this resolution was not carried by the General Committee, and in anticipation of such a result, we gave instructions to the official delegate of the Society to give notice of a motion—"That a separate section shall be formed, entitled Section H, to be devoted especially to anthropology."

Before I make any remarks on this point, I must, in justice to Mr. Blake, say that he carried out his orders most faithfully. Amongst other instructions given to that gentleman was the following:—"Should, however, the Committee of the Association decline to recognise anthropology, either in Section E or in some other suitable manner, you will return the papers to the Society's apartments." In the remarks made by Mr. Blake to the General Committee, these instructions were mentioned, and were by many construed into a threat on the part either of the official delegate or of the Society. I am sure it was never intended as such either by Mr. Blake or by the Committee of the Society from whom he received these instructions.

I need not remind any one who is at all acquainted with the working of Section E, of the manner in which papers bearing on the science of man have been treated since 1851. But to those unacquainted with this subject I will give a few facts which will make it clearer. I wish also to show that the dissatisfaction respecting the position of the science of man at the Association is of no recent date. At the formation of the British Association in 1831, no arrangement was made for ethnology, for the best of reasons, on which I shall have presently a few words to say. In 1844, a sub-section for ethnology was appointed, in connection with Section D (zoology and botany). But this sub-section was not considered suitable by the ethnologists of that day, for we find that in the same year, when the Association met at York, a proposal was made by Dr. Richard King, the honorary secretary of the Ethnological Society, for a distinct section for ethnology, and this, although supported by Dr. Prichard and others, was negatived by the Committee of the Association. Dr. Prichard, a few years later, makes the following observations on this point\*:—

\* Anniversary Address, 1847, *Trans. of Ethno. Soc.*, vol. i, p. 301.

"In the meetings of the British Association alone, ethnology claims but a subordinate place in the section of Natural History. The reason assigned for this arrangement is, that the natural history of man is a part of the natural history of living creatures, and that there is an obvious propriety in referring to one division the history of all organised beings, namely, of all those beings which exist in successive generations, destined one after another to rise, flourish, and decay—a lot to which are alike subjected the lords of the creation and the worms on which they tread, and the plants and animals which they consume for their daily food. But though the natural history of man in a technical arrangement, be made a department of zoology, it is easy to show that the main purport of ethnological inquiries is one distinct from zoology; and the reference of both these subjects to one section of the British Association, can only have arisen from inadvertence."

These remarks were made in 1847, and Dr. Prichard's death at the end of the following year unfortunately prevented him from again advocating the claims of his favourite science to a special section. The students of ethnology were at that time very few, and the death of their chief rendered any opposition on their part to being entirely extinguished quite out of the question. The destroying angel who annihilated the Ethnological sub-section was Sir Roderick Murchison, who takes honour to himself for this exploit. Addressing the British Association at Oxford in 1860, he said:—

"It fell to my lot, in 1858, to offer a few words to the geographers and ethnologists who were assembled at Leeds. I then explained to the assembled members the satisfaction I felt in proposing, at the Edinburgh meeting in 1850, the formation of a separate section for geography and ethnography, to represent the letter E, left vacant by our medical associates who had seceded to found an association of their own. Until that year geography had been attached exclusively to the geological section, in which, in truth, it was submerged by the numerous memoirs of my brethren of the rocks."

Now, Sir Roderick did not like geography to be submerged in geology, and yet he felt no compunction in submerging ethnographical or ethnological papers amongst geographical ones. We give great honour to him for what he has done for geographical science, but I know of no ethnologist or anthropologist who will thank him for destroying the sub-section of ethnology. There is much in our science which can never be made popular, and for which the "Ladies' Section, E," is hardly the fit place. Thus we find the official reporter of the doings of Section E, informing the Ethnological Society in 1861, that at the meeting in Manchester in the same year papers were read before section E, on subjects but little interesting or instructive to students of the science of man, which, says the reporter,\* "consisted of questions of railroads, telegraphs, ship-canal, earth-

\* See Abstract of Report on Ethnological Papers read at Manchester, 1861, by James Hunt (at that time), Secretary to Section E, and Hon. Secretary of the Ethnological Society of London. *Trans. Ethno. Soc.*, vol. ii, new series, p. 2.

quakes, volcanic eruptions, and the formation of icebergs." Will any one contend that a section which discusses such questions is a place for the science of anthropology? At Newcastle, the Rev. Dr. Hincks made some very forcible remarks as to the necessity of a separate section for anthropology, and perhaps a sub-section for philology. It was publicly stated at the meeting that some members of the Association had said that it was useless to attend the meetings to gain any information respecting the progress of the science of man while the geographers so completely occupied the field as they have done for many years past. On an appeal made for the admission of anthropology into section E, Sir Roderick objected that the section was already overburdened with papers, and he proposed "that the anthropologists be invited to attach themselves to some other section of the Association more suitable than the section of geography and ethnology." It has been suggested that anthropology should become a sub-section of the zoological section. But if this arrangement was unsatisfactory twenty years ago, what would it be now? There can be no doubt on the minds of those acquainted with the extent and objects of anthropological science, that there should be a special section devoted to it. There ought to be, and, I believe, ere long there will be: would it were in our power to say there shall be. But, gentlemen, all our efforts may be useless. The Society may be unanimous on this point; but unfortunately the decision of this matter does not rest with us, but with the General Committee of the British Association. Last year our admission to section E was opposed by some leading members of the Royal Geographical Society, who, I am glad to hear will now give their support to the proposal for a separate section. I trust, also, that Sir Roderick Murchison, as the intimate friend of two of the most illustrious anthropologists of modern times, I mean Karl Ernst Von Baer and the late Andreas Retzius, will support the motion. But we must not rely on those who are not Fellows of our Society for support in this matter. We must show the General Committee that we have a good cause, and that it will really be for the benefit of science that a special section should be devoted to anthropology. I may say we are already receiving papers to be submitted to this new section. Let every member of the Society use his influence, and I have no fear for the result. The President elect of the Association has, at all times, expressed his views that the Association must adapt itself to the age and to the progress of science. Let us not be content by using our influence with others, but be at the post ourselves, support by our voices and votes the cause of anthropological science, and rescue it from the degradation of which the learned Dr. Prichard complained nearly twenty years ago, and under which it is still suffering.

In soliciting members of the Society to prepare papers for this new section, it has at once been inquired, "But what will you do with the papers if the section is not appointed?" So frequently has this question been asked, that I have been obliged to consider the matter, and, after some consultation with my colleagues, we have determined on a course of action which I trust will not be misconstrued

either into a threat, or as showing the slightest disrespect to the British Association, or even to the General Committee. This matter has not yet been under the consideration of the Council of the Society, and I must be held solely responsible for the suggestions which I feel it my duty to make on this subject. We have been refused admission into section E, and if we are also refused a separate section, no other course seems to be open to us than to form an independent section or rather congress of our own, and to continue to hold this until, what we believe to be, our just claims are recognised. I sincerely trust that there will be no cause for this, for the work which already devolves on the officers of the Society is very considerable, and much labour would be entailed on all concerned in this matter were we obliged to make all the arrangements necessary for the holding of an "Anthropological Congress." If we were supported by the Council of the British Association in our petition for a special section, we should have no fear of a refusal. If, on the other hand, they decline to recommend such an appointment, we shall be obliged to act accordingly. In any case, therefore, I hope anthropological science will be advanced. I myself, especially, would gladly shrink from the work and responsibility of bringing to a successful issue the first British Anthropological Congress. But the fellows of the Society may rest assured that I will shrink from no labour or anxiety when I feel convinced that I can in any way aid in the promotion and diffusion of anthropological truths, for which this Society was established.

Before I leave this subject let me add that should we be compelled to adopt this course, it will in no way, I trust, estrange us from the British Association, which has been the means of doing so much in popularising science in this country. Could we feel that the opposition to the proposals respecting the recognition of anthropology were based simply on scientific reasons, and that the question was considered on its own merits, I, for one, should bow with respect to such a decision. But, gentlemen, we feel that the opposition to the recognition of anthropology is founded on reasons, in many cases, altogether unscientific, and the responsibility of any disavowal of ourselves from the British Association must rest with the General Committee for allowing themselves to be led away by the arguments of our opponents.

Having said thus much respecting the recognition of anthropology, let me direct your attention for a short time to the point from which I started on introducing this subject, as we shall see that the chief objections made to the recognition of our science are entirely based on a mistaken interpretation of the extent and object of it, and of the history and etymology of the term anthropology.

I have already made some remarks on the arguments which were used at Bath respecting the meaning of the two words Anthropology and Ethnology, and as there appears to be a considerable amount of misunderstanding as to the definition of these words, I purpose now to make some further observations on this important subject. Nothing can be more instructive than to trace the origin of



words and to see the meaning which has been attached to them at different periods of their history. A statement was made to the General Committee of the Association at Bath that ethnology was an older word than anthropology. This statement has had a most beneficial effect, for it set an accomplished member of our Society on an investigation of its truth, and a detailed account of this inquiry will, I hope, be shortly laid before you by Mr. Bendyshe, under the title of *The History of Anthropology*. Unknown to that gentleman I had also been spending my leisure moments in endeavouring to trace the origin and different meanings attached to the words anthropology, ethnography, and ethnology. But before I enter on that subject, I will give the conclusions to which Mr. Bendyshe's investigations have led him, which he summarises in these words :—

“The word anthropology is first used as the title of a book on science by Hundt, sometimes called *Magnus Canis*, in 1501.

“Again, in 1535, by Galeazzo Capella, *Anthropologia, ovvero un ragionamento della natura umana*—quite in the modern sense.

“Then frequently by the writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

“In English, *Anthropologie illustrated*, is the title of a work published anonymously in London, 1655.

“Anthropology is recognised as an English word in Todd's Johnson; ethnology is not.

“I do not find any trace of the existence of the word ethnology prior to its adoption by the French Society in 1839. They first of all assumed the title of *Société d'Ethnologues*, but in the Government certificate are called *d'Ethnologie*.

“The word does not occur in Prichard's first edition nor in Balbi, *Intr. to Atlas Ethnographique* of 1828, and as he enters into all the terms of the science, it seems impossible, if it had then any existence, that he could have passed it over. The word ethnography appears to be the only one he knew.

“In Knight's *Penny Cyclopædia*, a popular work, 1833, there is a very judicious little article on anthropology, and another on anthropography, ethnography is mentioned as a branch of it. Ethnology seems an unknown word, and the German *Völker-kunde*, which would now be translated ethnology, is there rendered *people-knowledge*, which implies complete ignorance of the word ethnology. Ethnography seems to be first used by Niebuhr.”

Now for my own inquiries :

First, What is the origin and meaning of the word anthropology ? Aristotle uses *ανθρωπολογος* for “one who speaks or treats of men” (Eth. iv, 8); and it is a mere accident that the word *ανθρωπολογία* does not occur. The use of this compound by Aristotle is very significant.

Until recently it has been thought that Casmann (Casmannus Otho), rector of the school and preacher at Stade, where he died in 1607, was the first who used the word anthropology in an extended sense; but this is not the fact, for Hundt (*Magnus Canis*) published a work at

Leipsic in 1501, entitled *Anthropologium*. His book is of great interest, as he is asserted to be the first author who used the new art of wood-engraving for anatomical purposes. The work of Casmann is, however, more nearly allied to what we now understand by anthropology. His work, entitled *Secunda pars Anthropologiæ* (Hanoviae, 1596), consists of about 900 pages, and treats of the most abstruse questions concerning human nature, both physical and psychological. I can find nothing published in English before 1655, under the title of anthropology, except the work already mentioned.

In 1707 the widow of Dr. James Drake published two large volumes entitled *Anthropologia Nova*. The same year there was published in Jena, a work on *Anthropologia*, by Teichmayer.

In Chambers' *Encyclopædia*, published in 1740, the following definition of anthropology is given:—"A discourse upon man and human nature. Anthropology includes the consideration both of the human body and soul, with the laws that affect their union, etc."

If we refer to the dictionaries of the period, we get the following definitions of anthropology:—

1749—Martin, "Description of a man's body and soul."

1753—Bailey, "Description of a man, or man's body."

1771—Dyche, "Description of the whole man, both soul and body."

1772—Barlow, "A treatise upon man, considered in a state of health, including a consideration both of the body and soul, with the laws of their motion."

1772—Diderot and d'Alembert—"A treatise on man."

1800—J. Brown's edition of the union dictionary of Johnson, Sheridan, and Walker—"The doctrine of the structure or nature of man."

In 1788 there was published, at Lausanne, a work entitled *Anthropologie, ou science générale de l'homme*.

Later, the meaning of anthropology was considerably extended, and the following is a translation from an article which appeared in 1833 in the *Encyclopédie des gens du monde: répertoire universel des sciences, des lettres, et des arts*: "Adopting the most extended signification of the word anthropology, this science is an assemblage of many known facts which are connected together, and which bear particular names, and for the development of which the reader is referred to the respective articles. Anthropology embraces—1st. The knowledge of the structure of the body and of its parts. 2nd. The knowledge of the functions of the body and of its parts. 3rd. The knowledge of the dietetic rules to preserve health. 4th. The knowledge of the faculties of the soul and of the mind, and of their relations with the body. This last science is the philosophy of man, and it involves especially, 1st. *Ideology*, or the knowledge of the intellectual faculties. 2nd. *Logic*, or the art of reasoning. 3rd. Knowledge of the inclinations, sentiments, affections, and passions. 4th. Knowledge of morality and of natural religion. 5th. The knowledge, finally, of the government of mankind.

"This last includes—The knowledge of rights and natural duties

of prosperity. The knowledge of the social institutions concerning education, *i.e.*, the art of preserving and of improving the human species. The art of procuring to society the advantages of wealth. The art of assisting the unfortunate. The art of maintaining public order. The art, finally, of the preservation of peace."

I will now quote two passages from Blumenbach, which, however, will be sufficient to show that the illustrious author used the word in exactly the same sense as we do at this day. These instances occur in the dedication of his work *De Generis Humani Varietate Nativa*, to the then President of the Royal Society, Sir Joseph Banks, which was published in 1795.

"When I visited London, three years ago . . . you gave me in my turn the unrestricted use of the collections of treasures relating to the study of anthropology, in which your library abounds; I mean the pictures and the drawings, etc., taken by the best artists from the life itself."

And yet we sometimes hear it said that anthropology merely means anatomy or craniology! Then, again, he says:

"When a more accurate knowledge of the nations who are dispersed over the southern ocean had been obtained by the cultivators of natural history and anthropology, it became very clear that the Linnæan divisions of mankind could be no longer maintained."\*

The cultivators of anthropology in 1795. Properly speaking, we must remember that up to the period of Blumenbach there was no science of man, and the word anthropology was consequently not much used. Professor Marx, in his life of Blumenbach, 1840,† says, "It was a happy chance that his first literary work was concerned with the races of men, and thus physical anthropology became the centre of the crystallisation of his activity." A few years later (1847) M. Flourens, in his *Eloge* to the Paris Academy, says,‡ "It is to M. Blumenbach that our age owes anthropology." In another place, he observes,§ "The division of races is the real difficulty of the day, the obscure problem of anthropology, and will be so for a long time." I need only quote one more instance, as to the meaning which the greatest scientific writers have attached to the word anthropology. M. Flourens observes,\* "There never was a scholar, author, or philosopher who seemed more adapted to endow us with the admirable science of anthropology." I need go no further in tracing the meaning of this word, as we must all agree that it is admirably exemplified in the writings of the father of the science, the illustrious Blumenbach.

I will now examine the origin and different meanings attached to the word ethnography.

Mr. Bendyshe thinks it was first used by Niebuhr, but in France it is generally considered that M. Balbi invented the word. I think, however, that the word was first used in Germany; for we find both the words *ethnographie* and *ethnographie* are used in Campe's

\* See Life and Anthropological Writings of Blumenbach, edited by T. Bendyshe, 1865, p. 8.

† Loc. cit., p. 149.

§ Loc. cit., p. 56.

‡ Loc. cit., p. 49.

|| Loc. cit., p. 58.

edition of Adelung, 1807-12, with an explanation, *Volksbeschreibung*, description of peoples.

Nearly twenty years later, Balbi, in the introduction to his *Atlas Ethnographique*, Paris, 1826, p. 69, says: "*Ethnographie* and *ethnographie*—These two terms should, strictly speaking, be only applied to the science having for its object the classification of peoples, as *ethnos* signifies in the Greek, *people*. But as the study of languages, especially that part which treats of their classification, has, as yet, no name generally adopted; that the term *linguistique*, borrowed from the German, is displeasing to some savants, and as the terms *glossographie* and *glossographie*, which are more appropriate, cannot be employed in the sense we require, we thought that we might venture to further extend the terms *ethnographie* and *ethnographie*, and include in them the classification of languages. In point of fact, if people are only people because they speak different languages, the classification of peoples will correspond to the classification of languages, and thus the term *ethnographie* may, it appears to us, supplant those of *linguistique* and *glossographie*, or that of *idiomographie*, as proposed by Malte-Brun. For want of better terms, we consider ourselves authorised to use the terms *ethnographie* and *ethnographie* in the sense indicated, in order to avoid circumlocution."

A very lucid definition of ethnography is given by Cardinal Wiseman in his lecture in 1836:—"I mean *ethnography*, or the classification of nations from the comparative study of languages, a science born, I may say, almost within our memory."\*

"This science is also called by the French *linguistique*, or the study of language; it is also known by the name of comparative philology. These names will sufficiently declare the objects and methods of study; and I will not promise any other definition, as I trust you will gradually, as my subject unfolds, become acquainted with its entire range."†

Dr. Wiseman often speaks of the distinction between what he called "philological ethnography" and what might not inaptly be styled "physiognomical ethnography." Yet eleven years later we find Dr. Prichard saying, alluding to Dr. Latham, "a learned member of this Society, who has contributed greatly to its extension, has proposed to term it 'ethnographical philology.'" Perhaps there is some profound difference between "philological ethnography" and "ethnographical philology." But Dr. Prichard objected to the terms "ethnographical philology," and says, "To this I have only to object, that the study in question is not ethnographical, but ethnological;" and he proposes a new term, *palælexia* or "the archæology of languages."‡

We are not aware what has become of this grand science, "ethnographical philology." It is sufficient for us now to observe, that the word does not appear in the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française*, nor in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* of 1842, nor in the *Encyclopædia Metro-*

\* Connection between Science and Revealed Religion, London, p. 9.

† P. 10.

‡ Annual Address, in Trans. of Ethno. Soc., vol. ii, p. 121.

*politana* of 1845. Dr. Dieffenbach,\* in 1842, defined ethnography to be "an authentic description of the physical condition of each nation." Dr. Prichard, in 1847, in his report to the British Association, in speaking of Blumenbach's division of mankind into five races, says, "This distribution was complete, so far as the ethnographical knowledge of the time allowed it to be."†

Since that period the word ethnographical has been used by the northern antiquaries to designate works of human industry, such as exist in the Ethnographical Museum of Copenhagen.

Mr. Luke Burke, in 1848, said,‡ "Ethnography, or the natural history of man."

I have now briefly sketched the history of the words anthropology and ethnography, and we find that the former has been in use more or less in the sense in which we now use it for the last two hundred years; and that since the time of Blumenbach, it has had a definite scientific meaning, being used by all the chief writers on mankind, as meaning the science of man, or mankind.

We here also see that the first use of the word ethnography does not extend beyond fifty years, and that the meanings which were originally attached to it have been continually changing; and it remains for anthropologists to decide whether they will give a definite, logical, scientific meaning to this word, or whether it shall be expunged entirely from the terminology of anthropological science.

We now come to the origin and meaning of the word Ethnology. All my inquiries respecting the first use of the word ethnology agree with the conclusions arrived at by Mr. Bendyshe, viz., that the word was not used before the formation of the Paris Ethnological Society in 1839. A correspondent has informed me that the word was occasionally used in some historical or philological works in France before that period; but it is equally certain that none of the great French writers of the period, like Desmoulins, Gerdy, or Broc, ever used the word.

And here it may be useful to trace the history of the formation of the Paris Society, in order that we may discover if possible the scientific meaning which those who first used the word ethnology attached to it. In 1838 there was established in London a society called the "Aborigines' Protection Society," which was presided over by Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton. This society deputed Dr. Hodgkin to proceed to the Continent, in order to establish a similar society in Paris. Dr. Hodgkin entered into negotiations with a well known English naturalist, long resident in Paris—William Edwards—but it was found impossible to found a society having for its object the discussion of social or political questions, as this was contrary to the French laws.

It was decided, however, that such a philanthropic society should be founded, but that it should have a scientific title. At last they coined a scientific-sounding title, first calling themselves *ethnologues*,

\* Transactions of Ethnological Society, vol. i, p. 18.

† Report of the British Association for 1847, p. 233.

‡ Ethnological Journal, edited by Luke Burke, p. 1.

which, however, was afterwards changed, and the association was then denominated the *Société d'Ethnologie de Paris*. And here comes the most curious part of the subject. William Edwards, it is said, was the founder of the Paris Ethnological Society, and Dr. Hodgkin says,\* “Ethnology very much engaged Dr. Edwards’ attention.” After such a statement, the society will perhaps be surprised to learn that William Edwards never once used the word “ethnology” in any of his scientific writings. They will also perhaps be more surprised when I say that he actually protested against the use of the word by the insertion, in the first volume of the memoirs of the society, of a memoir entitled, *Esquisse sur l'état actuel de l'Anthropologie, ou l'histoire naturelle de l'homme*. This memoir was never communicated to the society, because it is believed the author was anxious to avoid discussion on the subject with his non-scientific associates. It was published in 1841, and when the death of William Edwards a few years later deprived the society of its guiding power, the members fell into the sentimental extravagances on Negrophilism, and the revolution of 1848 put an end to their meetings. At this time the society adjourned for a month, but on the day appointed no members attended, and the society has not met since. During the existence of this society, however, scientific men continued to use the word anthropology, and more than twenty years ago M. Serres added to his professorship of human anatomy the sub-title of anthropology, and has occupied himself exclusively with the human races. For the last ten years the chair has been recognised as entirely devoted to anthropology, the original title of human anatomy being omitted.

We now come to the introduction of the word ethnology into England, and the meanings which have been attached to it; and we cannot do better than see how Dr. Hodgkin defines anthropology, ethnography, and ethnology. His first paper to the Society commences in these words: “The study of Man, in its most extended sense, to which the term Anthropology is fitly applied, is a most complicated subject, presenting such various points that it admits of being divided into several departments, each of which may constitute or appertain to a separate science.” He goes on to say, “Man may be studied in his physical conformation,” “as an intellectual being,” “as a gregarious animal,” “in relation to the lapse of time which his race has existed,” “as to diet, climate, mode of life, and inherited peculiarities—collectively by government, religion, influence of surrounding nations.” The author thus defines ethnography: “Writers of the highest antiquity have spoken of man as formed into various distinct groups which have been known as separate nations,” and “these facts are blended with the writings of historians and geographers;” “and whether separated into a distinct study or not the description of them has acquired the peculiar and appropriate name of Ethnography or the description of nations.” We see by the above lists of subjects what the author did not consider as belonging to ethnology. He then says, “that the in-

\* Trans. of Ethno. Soc., vol. i, p. 34.

+ Report of the British Association, 1847, p. 23.

dividuals presenting these different characters, are very differently affected by the climate to which they are exposed;" and he then remarks, "The study of this very interesting subject forms a branch of science to which the name Ethnology has been given."

The study of man was *fitly* termed anthropology. The description of nations had the *appropriate* name of ethnography; but not a word in favour of the fitness or appropriateness of the word ethnology even in the sense in which the author used it!

In the preface to the first volume of the *Transactions of the American Ethnological Society*, founded 19th November, 1842, we read\* that this Society "was established for the promotion of a most important and interesting branch of knowledge, that of man and the globe he inhabits."

Dr. Prichard in 1847, says, "Ethnology is, in fact, more nearly allied to history than to natural science." Again, "Geology is like ethnology, a history of the *past*."

I need hardly remark that Dr. Prichard never used the word ethnology in the first edition of his *Physical Researches into the History of Mankind*, and that he only adopted it after its importation from France. It will also be seen in what confusion he left the terms ethnology and ethnography by his objection to the use of the latter term in the sense that it was then employed.

I must also call your attention to the fact that the word was never used by Lawrence nor by Knox; even as late as the publication of his book in 1850.

Morton, up to 1846, did not use the word, and he was too scientific to accept the definition proposed by Dr. Prichard. In 1846, Dr. Morton published a work *On the Ethnography and Archaeology of the American Aborigines*.

Neither Colonel Hamilton Smith nor Van Amringe, although both writing in 1848, use the word "ethnology."

It is, indeed, very remarkable how few scientific writers have used the words ethnology; ethnography is used in preference, simply because occasionally some logical definite meaning can be attached to it. The science of man—anthropology—is always used in a different sense from ethnography or ethnology. Mr. Hotze, for instance, writes:—"The last great struggle between science and theology is the one we are now engaged in—the *Natural History of Man*—it has now, for the first time, a fair hearing before Christendom, and the only question we should ask is 'daylight and fair play.'"<sup>†</sup>

Here are two extracts from Mr. Hotze's edition of Gobineau:—

"The sickening moral degradation of some of the branches of our species is well known to the students of anthropology, though, for obvious reasons, details of this kind cannot find a place in books destined for the general reader."<sup>‡</sup>

"As many of the terms of modern ethnography have not yet found

\* Trans. of American Ethno. Soc., vol. i, p. ix.

† Appendix to Hotze's Gobineau, p. 506.

‡ Hotze, 454.

their way into the dictionaries, I shall offer a short explanation of the meaning of this word, for the benefit of those readers who have not paid particular attention to that science.”\*

“These remarks on the ethnography of the Bible.”†

“In fact, nothing can be more incomplete, contradictory, and unsatisfactory than the ethnography of Genesis. . . . All this shows that we can rely no more upon its ethnography than upon its geography, astronomy, cosmogony, geology, zoology, etc.”‡

From an attentive perusal of the writings of Dr. Prichard it will be gathered, that he was greatly perplexed as to the meaning which should be given to the words ethnology and ethnography. In the second edition of his *Natural History of Man*,§ he thus uses the term ethnology, “Our contemporaries are becoming more and more convinced that the history of nations termed ethnology, must be mainly founded on the relations of their languages.” In the same work|| he writes a chapter on American Ethnology, in which he says, “Gallatin is still the chief work of authority on the ethnology of the Northern Americans, and the only work in which these races are classified according to the extent of knowledge as yet acquired by the distinctions and affinities of their languages.” There is a chapter “On Indian Ethnography” and one entitled “Ethnography of the ancient Egyptians.” This chapter opens with the following sentence:—“A most interesting and really important addition has lately been made to our knowledge of the physical character of the ancient Egyptians.”

In his preface to the same work¶ he speaks thus:—“Very brief indeed must necessarily be a summary of universal ethnography.” An examination of this and other passages in Dr. Prichard’s writings, leads to the opinion that ethnology was used chiefly in connection with language, and ethnography with physical character. Dr. Prichard was well aware that such a distinction was not accepted by his fellow workers; and there was published by a student of anthropology, the accomplished Dr. S. G. Morton, a paper entitled “Observations on Egyptian Ethnology, derived from Anatomy, History, and the Monuments.”

The word ethnology does not occur in the seventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 1842; nor in the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*; nor in Todd’s *Johnson*; nor in the *Penny Cyclopædia*; nor in Brande’s *Dictionary of Science*, 1842, although in all these works the word anthropology occurs.

In *Types of Mankind*, Dr. Nott used the word anthropology in its right signification: “The classification of M. Jacquinot is supported by much ingenuity. . . . Like all his predecessors, however, who have written on anthropology, he seems not to be versed in the monumental literature of Egypt. The ancient Egyptians had attempted a systematic anthropology at least 3500 years ago.”

Agassiz always, I believe, uses the word ethnography, and it would be possible to give an unlimited number of quotations to prove that

\* Hotze, p. 457.

† Loc. cit., p. 511.

‡ Loc. cit., p. 583.

† Page 512.

§ Published in 1845, p. 152.

¶ Loc. cit., p. vii.



the word ethnology has in science no definite meaning, and that it is not used by many of the chief writers on the science of man.

Before I quit this subject, however, I cannot help calling your attention to the curious transformation which the "Philological Ethnography" of Cardinal Wiseman underwent, in 1847, under the manipulation of Baron Bunsen.\* This same science then became "Comparative Ethnologic Philology," and we had the "results of Egyptian ethnologic philology." So the "Ethnographical Philology"† of Dr. Latham has since become "Philological Ethnology."‡ Will this change lead back to Dr. Wiseman's "Philological Ethnography"? We are especially anxious to know what has become of the science of *ethnography*, as Dr. Wiseman§ told the world thirty years ago: "It is by the simple history of this science that we shall see the Mosaic account of the dispersion of mankind most pleasingly confirmed." Mr. Cull (a former Secretary of the Ethnological Society) stated that these four lectures on "ethnography" were on "ethnology"!

All this confusion compels one to inquire, What is ethnology? What does the word really mean? Is it a science, or any part of a science? These are questions, gentlemen, which I feel bound to ask you to consider most fully. If we use the words as we have hitherto done, we must give them a more definite meaning. We now say that ethnology is a part of anthropology, and yet no two persons appear to be agreed as to what the word ethnology means. One says "it is the science of nations;" but nations may be a combination of wholly different elements; and if this is the correct definition, ethnology must be, to a great extent, a political subject. Another says, ethnology means the science of races.|| But what races? All animal races?¶ "No," replies a third, "the races of man."

Let us now examine the meaning attached to the words by other writers on the subject; and first of all that given by the present senior Secretary of the Ethnological Society, one of our learned honorary fellows, Mr. Wright, who said,\*\* (in 1855) "It is the task of the ethnologist to trace the migrations of races and the process of the formation of nations which preceded what is more strictly termed history."

Dr. Latham writes (in 1855), "The word†† [ethnology], like the department of knowledge which it expresses, is new; so new that it may almost be said to be unfixed both in power and in form. Instead of *ethnology*, many writers say *ethnography*. Some use the two words indifferently. Others use both, but distinguish between them; the latter meaning the *descriptive*, the former the *speculative* portion of the subject."

\* Report of British Association, 1847, p. 265.

† Essays, p. 319.

‡ Encyc. Brit., 8th ed., vol. ix, p. 343.

§ Lectures, 1836, p. 10.

|| See an article which appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* for October 1848, entitled "Ethnology, or the Science of Races".

¶ Luke Burke, "The Future", p. 214.

\*\* The History of France, vol. i, p. 3.

†† Encyclopædia Britannica, 8th ed., vol. ix, p. 341.

Dr. Nott says,\* "The term 'ethnology,' has generally been used as synonymous with 'ethnography.'"

Now, if they mean the same thing, we clearly do not want them both.

Dr. Latham remarks,† "The chief criteria of the animals below man are moral rather than physical; of man they are moral rather than physical. Anthropology gives us the naturalists' view of our species. Ethnology gives us the historic view of it. Yet ethnology is different from ordinary history." Again, he says: "Ethnology is the general archæology of man." Is there an archæology of animals?

Dr. Latham is a follower of Prichard, who in nearly the last years of his life attempted to give a determinate meaning to the words ethnology and ethnography. His definition has not, however, been accepted. He says, "Palæontology includes both geology and ethnology; geology is the archæology of the globe, ethnology that of its human inhabitants." But no one has followed him in the confusion of terms which he thus proposed to introduce respecting the meaning of the word archæology. The proposal would have for its effect the abolishment of the word archæology and the substitution of the word ethnology in its place. Archæology is history deduced from the relics of the past, and according to Dr. Prichard, "Ethnology has for the object of its investigations, not *what is*, but *what has been*."‡

Dr. Latham says, "There existed the materials for anthropology when the first pair of human beings stood alone on the face of the earth, and there would exist the same materials for anthropology if the world were reduced to the last human family. But ethnology is a study which has no existence where there is no variety." If this be so, there can clearly be no such science as ethnology for those who believe there are no differences in mankind.

An extraordinary confusion as to the meaning of the term ethnology will also be found in Dr. Latham's *Essays, Chiefly Philological and Ethnographical*.§ Ethnology is there used in the following sense: "Now, both the languages have fundamental affinities with the Athabaskan, and *vice versâ*; whilst it is generally the case in ethnology, that two languages radically connected with a third, are also radically connected with each other."

The most recent attempt to give a definite meaning to the word ethnology is that made by M. Cournot.|| Writing in 1861, he says, "Anthropology is the natural history of man . . . ethnology, on the other hand, should be occupied with all the accidental facts to which the circumstance of the grouping of men into distinct societies give birth." He proposes to call such varieties of men "ethnological varieties." Will this definition be accepted? and will ethnologists for the future devote themselves to the investigation of these "accidental facts?" It is rather unkind to ethnologists for one author to suggest that ethnology means the speculative part of a science, and for

\* Type of Mankind, p. 49.

+ Loc. cit., p. 341.

† Address of Ethno. Soc., vol. ii, p. 302.

§ 1860, p. 271.

|| See Anthropological Review, vol. ii, 1864, p. 275.

another to assert that it is their duty to investigate "accidental facts."

I have searched in vain for a definition of the word by the most voluminous modern writer on ethnology, Mr. John Crawfurd. I trust he may be induced to give some definition to this word which may be accepted by his followers. I hope he may also inform us to what branch of "ethnology" belongs that long series of papers contributed to the Ethnological Society under the title of *On the Relation of Domestic Animals to Civilisation*.

Perhaps the following remarks by my friend Dr. Charnock, may assist in elucidating the true scientific meaning of the word ethnology. He writes:—

"I think we may translate ethnology, *science of the gentiles or heathens*. The origin of the word gentile (heathen) is deduced from the Jews, who called all those who were not of their name *gajin*, i.e., *gentes*, which, in the Greek translations of the Old Testament is rendered *τα εθνη*, in which sense it frequently occurs in the New Testament; as in Mat. vi, 32, 'All these things the gentiles (*τα εθνη*) seek.' Whence the Latin church also used *gentes* in the same sense as our *gentiles*, especially in the New Testament. But the word *gentes* soon got another signification, and no longer meant all such as were not Jews; but those only who were neither Jews nor Christians, but followed the superstitions of the Greeks and Romans, etc.\*

"St. Matthew (vi, 7) says, 'Use not vain repetitions as the heathens (*εθνικοι*) do.' On this verse Valpy says, '*Εθνικοι*, heathens, men who neither acknowledge nor worship the true God. Our word heathen is from the Greek *εθνη*, the heathens or gentiles, as distinguished from the Jews or believers.' Somner (Ang.-Sax. Dict.) gives *hæthen*, paganus, ethnicus, gentilis; *hæthendom*, paganismus, ethnicismus, gentilismus. Junius gives the Gothic *hæithnai* (the Greek, *εθνοι*) heathens. There is, indeed, no doubt that heathen and *εθνος* are the same word. Ethnology, *science of the heathens, gentiles, or pagans.*'"

Mr. Luke Burke, in 1848, attempted to give a definition of ethnology, which differs so widely from all those attempted before or since, that I am bound to give it in this place. And I would take this opportunity of observing that, although Mr. Burke has given a meaning to the word ethnology which cannot be defended and has not been accepted, he deserves much credit for attempting to found a science of mankind at a time when few dared to speak of the origin and development of man as questions entirely belonging to the domain of science.

The great error of the following definition is the use of the word ethnology instead of anthropology. "Ethnology," writes Mr. Burke,† "is a science which investigates the mental and physical differences of mankind, and the organic laws upon which they depend, and which seeks to deduce from these investigations, principles of human guidance in all important relations of social existence."

\* Valpy.

† Ethnological Journal, edited by L. Burke, 1848, p. 1.

I am sure that you will doubt with me whether such a definition could ever have been given to a word like ethnology; but we may consider that Mr. Burke found a "pretty" word with no scientific definition, and declared it to mean the science he had defined.

Mr. Burke at the same time (1848) wrote,\* "The leading doctrines of this science are now for the first time presented to the public." Writing in 1861, Mr. Burke said,† "But let ethnology be organised and developed, and the entire sweep of natural history becomes at once comparative ethnology." In 1848, ethnology was defined by the same author as "the science of human races." Ethnologists in 1861 were told "they need not travel to the ends of the earth, nor even look beyond the circle of their intimate friends, to find undescribed races, types of humanity demanding record and specification, and more deserving of both than the grosser distinctions of savage life." It will thus be seen that Mr. Burke uses the word ethnology: 1st. As the science of all races; meaning in reality the science of biology. Notwithstanding this definition, he says in the same place,‡ "The mind is everything in ethnology." 2nd. He differs from all other writers in using the word ethnology as partly meaning a description of races, which by all other writers is called ethnography, a term which Mr. Burke uses as meaning the natural history of man. Verily ethnology is a wonderful word!

Mr. Burke is very fond of the word "*ethnic*," meaning "racial," although in 1848 he wrote, "The genus *Homo*, like all other important genera of animals, was in the beginning divided by Nature into many different species and varieties, each of which was mentally and physically adapted to a determinate mode of life, and had its origin in a climate and region precisely suitable to its constitution."§ If this be so, the whole matter is settled: but we anthropologists declare this to be the very matter under dispute. Dr. Latham says, without difference in mankind there is no such thing as ethnology. But what does Mr. Burke mean by "race," or "ethnic"? His definition is sufficiently complete to banish the word entirely from our use. In what he called his *Fundamental Doctrines of Ethnology* we find the following,|| "Ethnical differences are such as arise from difference of race."

This is one of the fundamental doctrines of ethnology—truly a magnificent and most complicated science—but its difficulties are nothing in comparison to anthropology, for we do not know on what ethnical or racial differences really do depend, and indeed some of us are not even convinced that they exist.

But wishing to give the latest definition of ethnology, I must dwell on two other points. One of the honorary secretaries of the Ethnological Society, Mr. Francis Galton, has recently issued what perhaps may be described as an important manifesto on the present state of ethnology in this country, in a series of "ethnological inquiries on the innate character and intelligence of different races."

\* Loc. cit., p. 1. + "The Future", May 1861.

† Loc. cit., p. 217.

§ Ethnological Journal, edited by L. Burke, 1848, p. 7.

|| Loc. cit., p. 5.

I must, in the first place, congratulate the Society on having a secretary with sufficient boldness to acknowledge the existence of different races of mankind. I shall now merely quote five of the questions out of thirty-four, to show what are, in England at this time, considered to be "ethnological" inquiries. I will simply quote from No. 21 to No. 26:—"Has he a strong natural sense of right and wrong, and a sensitive conscience? Does he exhibit to his religious teachers any strong conviction of an original sinfulness of his nature; or the reverse? Is he much influenced by ceremonial observances, such as those of the Roman Catholic Church? Is he a willing keeper of the Sabbath? Has he any strong religious instincts; is he inclined to quiet devotion? Is he ascetic, self-mortifying, and self-denying, or the contrary? Is he inclined to be unduly credulous or unduly sceptical?"

I think these questions deserve especial record as showing the meaning attached to the words "ethnological inquiries" in the year 1864. I would, however, suggest the addition of one other question, such as, "Can he give any definition of the word 'ethnology?' if so, record the same."

Within the last few weeks, too, I have heard a paper read at the Ethnological Society on "The Principles of Ethnology." I must confess that I was a little disappointed at not hearing a definition given of ethnology in a paper treating of the "principles" of the science; but I was certainly much instructed to learn that the "principles of ethnology" consisted in a recommendation of the author to the effect that it was necessary to make a collection of authentic portraits, and that this would enable us to discover the "principles of ethnology." Mr. Prideaux can hardly claim any originality in this matter, for we find the illustrious Blumenbach, seventy years ago, insisted on the desirability of a "collection of pictures of different nations, carefully drawn, taken from the life by the first artists;" and he at that time remarked, "It is clear that a collection of this kind, especially whenever it is invariably compared with such collections of skulls as I have been giving an account of, is one of the first, principal, and authentic sources of anthropological studies." He further well observes, that the popular drawings on this subject are so incorrect as to be "scarcely of any use for the natural history of mankind."\*

Blumenbach has sometimes been called the father of ethnology; but it is desecrating a sacred name to charge him with being the father of such an ill-defined study, or the author of such a meaningless word as ethnology is in science. It is hardly necessary to say that Blumenbach never used either the word ethnography or ethnology, which were only invented when the science of man became corrupted by the '*philological ethnographers*' attempts to overturn the truths of sound induction by speculation respecting an unity of origin of all languages.

Mr. Lubbock, the esteemed and accomplished President of the

\* Loc. cit., p. 169.

Ethnological Society, while using all his power to prevent the British Association admitting anthropology, made a statement not a little startling in the face of the facts I have mentioned. He is reported to have contended that anthropology and ethnology meant the same thing! This is indeed startling information. How long have they meant the same thing? and by whom are they used as synonymous terms? He "did not defend ethnology upon its derivation, perhaps upon that light it was not quite so good as anthropology."\* This seems to mean that anthropology is a better word to signify anthropological science than any other: a proposition which I will not attempt to dispute. In the English version of M. Morlot's recent *Researches on the Study of High Antiquity* we find these words, "Ethnology is to us what physical geography is for the geologist." Now, as physical geography is only a part of geology, if this simile holds good, ethnology is only a part of some other science. A part of what science? In using the word "us," does M. Morlot speak from an anthropological stand-point? Ethnology, meaning the study of man, in its present state, "is to be taken as our starting point; and we have already seen that it contributed largely in guiding the northern antiquaries into the right path."† Ethnology, then, used in the sense of a study of existing races, is a part of the science of archaeology? Or are both integral parts of the science of anthropology?

I alluded to Mr. Lubbock as the President of the Ethnological Society, but to my astonishment I find that in 1845, Dr. Prichard, in the second edition of his *Natural History of Man*, announced himself as "one of the vice-presidents of the Ethnographical Society of London." In the same place, he also describes himself as a corresponding member of the "Ethnographical Society of New York." Now, the first volume of the journal published by the so-called "Ethnological Society of London," is not dated until three years after the appearance of Dr. Prichard's book, in 1848. An interesting question thus arises, whether between the year 1845 and 1848 the name of this society was changed from ethnographical to ethnological? Or are we to suppose that Dr. Prichard was vice-president of a society of which he did not know the name?

And now I would beg to submit a few suggestions for your consideration. Although ethnology is a very new word in our language, it has still been current amongst us; I would certainly advocate its retention, if any scientific definition can be given to it. If this cannot be done the sooner we get rid of it the better.

Personally, I may frankly admit that my investigations have led me to believe that the word ethnology had better be expunged from the nomenclature of our science. We speak of ethnology as the science of human races; as this is the arbitrary meaning generally given to it. I have, however, explained the objections which all scientific naturalists must have to a word without a proper definition.

\* See Anthropological Review, vol. ii, p. 290.

† The Reader, Dec. 31, 1864.

The question which I have brought before you to day, is one which, must be freely and fully discussed. Two years ago, I proposed a committee to consider and report on the terminology of our science. The time has not yet arrived for that. But I think the time has come when we should all know what we mean by our own science—anthropology. Although an old word, anthropology is, in this country, a new science; and let us take a warning from the facts I have brought forward.

I think every unbiassed scientific man in Europe will admit that it is no stretch of the meaning which may be attached to the etymology of the word anthropology to say that it signifies the science of man and of mankind.

Nor do I think that there will be much difference of opinion as to the accuracy of the more general definition of the word proposed by the leader of French anthropologists, Paul Broca:—"The study of the human group, considered in itself and in its relation to the rest of Nature."

It appears to me that we may make three great divisions of our science. That part of our science which relates to the history of mankind on the earth, the late Rudolph Wagner has proposed to call by the most appropriate name of HISTORICAL ANTHROPOLOGY. By adopting this definition, we shall thus have a name for a portion of our science which we have sometimes called human palæontology. There can be no dispute about the meaning to be attached to these terms; and we shall all be agreed that historical anthropology really means the study of the science of man's past history.

The next great division of our science is the descriptive part, which the French writers have hitherto called ethnography, a term which is, however, used by the northern antiquaries, and indeed in our own national museum, in quite another sense. But it is quite certain that we cannot use the word ethnography as meaning remains of man's works of industry, and as a term to signify a description of the different peoples; or, as M. d'Omalus d'Halloy says, "*Des races humaines, ou éléments d'ethnographie,*" meaning a description of the existing races of man. I would propose for the future we should call this branch of our subject DESCRIPTIVE ANTHROPOLOGY.

And now I come to the third part of anthropology, for which there has hitherto been no word or definition which has been accepted, which some recent English and American writers have called ethnology; but which the illustrious anthropologist, Karl Ernst von Baer, now proposes we should call Comparative Anthropology. I would strongly urge the absolute necessity of adopting this proposal made by a man who has now for some time used it. I strongly urge the dispassionate consideration of the advisability of this step on those who have hitherto used the word ethnology as the science of human races, and I cannot but think they will feel convinced of the necessity for the adoption of this definition. I feel sure, also, that by doing away with the word ethnology, we shall be greatly

assisting the progress of science. Feeling this conviction strongly, I earnestly invite the ethnologists of this country to assist us in discarding the name they have hitherto used; and I am sure, we will join them most heartily in promoting that branch of our science, which I hope ere long will be unanimously recognised under the name of COMPARATIVE ANTHROPOLOGY.

I have been asked, gentlemen, if it be good policy on the part of our Society to attach so much importance to what it has pleased some of my friends to call "a mere name." I know not and care not whether it is good "policy" for our Society to do so: but every member has a right to hold and express his own views on this subject. If, however, I may speak on behalf of the Society, I would say that we are not fighting for a "mere name"; on the contrary, we are fighting on behalf of a clearly defined inductive science. We were opposed admission to the British Association ostensibly on account of our name. We are, therefore, compelled to fight on the grounds chosen by our adversaries; and I for one am content to let the issue of the battle be determined on this ground.

I believe that whether it is policy or not, it is certainly now our duty to use no terms which are incapable of rigid scientific definition. Are terms of no consequence in science?

Before I quit this subject, let me say that, although we recognise in some of the active members of the Ethnological Society our scientific adversaries, I hope our future struggle will be conducted in a spirit entirely free from all personal animosity. I hope that we all value more the success of our science than we do the success of our society. And here let me add, that I believe some of the Fellows of this Society have just cause to complain of the treatment (in some cases nearly amounting to insult), which they have received from some other students of science. But, gentlemen, let us all try to follow the beautiful precept, "When ye are reviled, revile not again." We must remember that the dignity of scientific men should prevent them indulging in the schoolboy's amusement of throwing dirt at one another. We live, too, in an age in which scientific truth is painfully wrestling against the fetters which have hitherto held the human mind with an iron grasp. These chains are relaxing daily, and the partisans of dogmatism are becoming alive to their danger. All personal quarrels between men of science do an injury to the cause of truth, by showing that we are not above the petty feeling and jealousies of theological sects. There are some men who have shown themselves enemies to our Society, and who have reviled myself and other members in no measured terms, and I have been even charged with bringing facts and opinions before the Society from interested motives. No one can entertain feelings of greater respect than I do for real scientific honesty, whether it is accompanied with views in which I agree or not; but is it our duty to look into other men's motives? Will it not be enough for us that we honestly express our own real scientific conviction? I therefore take this opportunity of saying, that I shall not notice the personal attacks made on myself or



my motives, whether they come from the press, the pulpit, or the chair. No one can be more conscious than I am of my utter unfitness to preside over a society like our own. Nor do I attempt to deny that, since the formation of the society, I may have brought odium on it, which I shall not attempt to defend or palliate. All I can say is, that I have acted up to the best of my ability, and have endeavoured to discharge the duties you have entrusted to my care without fearing the censure or courting the praise of any man or of any body of men. My office has been no sinecure; but I can truly say that my labour has been one of love. Nor, gentlemen, am I disposed to look back on our work as a failure. We have done for England what some illustrious men failed to do for Germany. Amongst the objects contemplated by the German Anthropological Congress of 1861 was, "The foundation of a periodical as the organ of anthropologists, which might be the means of promoting the study of anthropology, and make more generally known what is done in this respect in various places." This, however, they did not attempt to carry into execution; but we have at least the credit of having made this attempt, and it is for others to express their opinion as to the success of what we well knew to be an experiment. Germany, however, was before this country in the foundation of a scientific periodical entirely devoted to anthropology. There existed, for instance, Nasse's *Zeitschrift für Anthropologie*, which lived from 1818 to 1830. Then there was the *Central-Blatt für Anthropologie* in 1853-4, but which ceased to exist after a life of twelve months. But, independently of the *Anthropological Review*, which, as a society, we merely patronise, we have our own *Journal* for the record of what is said at our meetings. The following opinion of Von Baer on the importance of this point is especially worthy of note. Von Baer, in his address to the Anthropological Congress at Göttingen, said (Report, p. 26), "Before Professor Wagner and I ventured to invite you, we had considered the various modes by which anthropology might be enriched and rectified. The *Bulletins de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris* with their manifold contents were before us, and we asked ourselves whether something like it might not be effected in Germany. That which distinguishes and renders the transactions of that society so instructive consists in the animated discussions on the theories of the respective authors and the descriptions of travellers. These discussions rectify or amplify observations frequently resting on a very narrow basis. These transactions become the more instructive, as besides men who are well versed in zoology, physiology, anthropology, medicine, etc., other persons take part, such as naturalists, scientific travellers who have resided, or are still residing, in foreign countries, contribute to them. No German city offers such opportunity. Germany has no colonies. There is no want of men of science, but travellers in foreign parts, especially such who have long resided there, are rare. Hamburg is perhaps the only German town which contains many travellers from the various parts of the globe; but these are generally merchants who have only resided in the capitals of the respective countries. The Germans are, therefore, in this respect in

a less favourable condition than their neighbours on the other side of the Rhine; and greatly so when compared with their much favoured cousins on the other side of the Channel. They are, therefore, confined to collecting, digesting, and supplementing, besides the materials accessible to them, the anthropological observations and transactions of other nations."

There can be no doubt that this country does possess unrivalled advantages for the study of anthropology, and I cannot but trust that these advantages may be used by us in a manner they deserve. But as Rome was not built in a day, so neither can we immediately obtain results from our labours. The collection of only fifty skulls and five hundred volumes of reference may be considered a small result for two years' work. But we must remember that we have only really had a proper museum for six months, and that besides these skulls we have a variety of other objects, all throwing light on our science. We must also remember that all these, together with the five hundred volumes, are donations and that we could increase our museum and library to any extent, had we the means to do so. The special subscription now raising already amounts to £92, and this will enable us, together with other means at our disposal, to have a collection of works on anthropology which will be at least unrivalled in any library in this country.

In my opening address, I asked you to measure our labours not by our professions, but by our acts. I will even now not indulge in a speculation as to what we may do in future; but as regards the quantity of matter which we have caused to be printed during the past two years, you will perhaps allow me to say that it amounts altogether to two thousand seven hundred and ninety-six octavo pages. And as to the contributions to this work and its intrinsic value, any one acquainted with the literature of the subject must be convinced that our undertaking cannot fail to forward the cause of anthropological science. Every Fellow, too, of the Society must feel a just pride in the work of a Society which enabled the German scientific press to declare that Dr. Waitz's writings were not appreciated in Germany, although they were fully so in England. Had we not published a translation of a part of this work, it is not too much to assert that Dr. Waitz would have died without knowing that his labours were fully appreciated.

The past year has not been at all remarkable for the publication of anthropological works. On general anthropology the most important are Herbert Spencer *On the Principles of Biology*, and Draper *On the Intellectual Development of Europe*. Max Müller has issued a second volume of *Lectures on the Science of Language*, and we have had a translation of Professor Broca's little work on *Human Hybridity*. I must also mention a little book by M. Maire, entitled *L'Homme de la Nature et l'Homme de la Civilisation*.

Of works on historical anthropology, we have a new and cheaper edition, with considerable alterations, of Dr. Daniel Wilson's *Prehistoric Man*, and Carl Vogt's second volume of *Lectures on Man*. On this subject there have also been published the important researches of Messrs. Lartet and Christy, *Sur les Cavernes de Périgord*.

On descriptive anthropology we have had that most important and

valuable work of our Vice-President, entitled *A Mission to Dahome*. This is a work which must be recognised as the classical authority on the Dahomans. Captain Burton has added to the value of this work by giving a chapter containing his opinions on *The Negro's Place in Nature*, which should be consulted by all who are anxious to arrive at the truth on that subject. In this department there has also been published Vambéry's *Travels in Central Asia*, Baines' *Explorations in South-West Africa*, Grant's *Walk through Africa*, Michie's *Overland Route from St. Petersburg to China*.

Abroad we have had Werner's *Reisen der Preuss. Expedition nach China, Japan, und Siam*. Hochstetter's *Neu-Seeland*. Zimmermann's *Inseln des indischen Meeres*. Vogt's *Nordfahrt Entlang der Norwegisch. Küste, nach dem Nordcap*. Erkert, *Atlas ethnographique des provinces habitées par des Polonais*. Mathieu de Fossey, *Le Mexique*. Moure, *Les Indiens de la province de Dato Grosso*. Reuchgaric, *La Plata, Mœurs, Coutumes, etc.* Baril de la Heure, *L'Empire du Brésil, monographie de l'empire sud-américain*. Wortambers and L. de Rosny, *Tableau de la Cochinchine, rédigé sous les auspices de la Soc. ethnographique, avec une introduction par Paul de Bourgoing*. Dally, *Sur les races indigènes et sur l'archéologie du Mexique*. Delarue, *Le Monténégro, histoire, description, mœurs et usages*. Godard, *L'Espagne, mœurs et paysages*.

Very few works have been published on comparative anthropology. We have had Professor Kingsley's *Lectures on the Roman and Teuton*. The first volume of Carl Vogt's *Lectures on Man*. A second edition of Pouchet's *Plurality of Human Races*. A valuable article by Professor Daniel Wilson on *The Physical Characteristics of the Ancient and Modern Celt of Gaul and Britain*.

In Germany, we have had Zimmermann's *Malerische. Länder u. Völkerkunde*. The *Bibliothek der Länder u. Völkerkunde*. Hoffmann's *Encyclopädie der Erd., Völker und Staaten, Malerisches Universum oder Reisen um die Welt*. Hoffmann's *Die Erde u. ihre Bewohner*. Reichenbach, *Völker der Erde*. Berghaus's *Die Völker des Erdballs*. Oeser *Bilder aus dem Völkerleben*. *Das Grosse, Völker und Naturleben, Physiognomische Züge aus fernen Welttheilen*; Dieffenbach's *Vorschule der Völkerkunde*, and many others.

The forthcoming year, however, bids fair to supply the deficiency of the past one.

On general anthropology there is announced an English edition, by Mr. Bendyshe, of the *Life and Anthropological Works of Blumenbach*; and a volume of *Memoirs* read before our own Society. The publication is also contemplated of a translation, by Dr. D. H. Tuke, of the important Memoir of M. Gratiolet, on the *Convolutions of the Brain in Man and the Primates*; and Dr. Charnock, amongst other works, is engaged on a paper on the Basque language.

On historical anthropology there is announced a work on *Prehistoric Archaeology*, by Mr. John Lubbock; by one of our Fellows, Mr. Edward Burnet Tylor, a volume containing researches into the primitive history of mankind; and a translation of Gastaldi, *On the Marl Beds, and Evidences of High Antiquity in Italy*, by Mr. C. H. Chambers.

In descriptive anthropology, we expect a work on the inhabitants of the Viti islands by our Fellow Mr. W. T. Pritchard. We are also looking forward with much interest to the publication by the Paris Anthropological Society and by ourselves of general instructions respecting descriptive anthropology, which will be accompanied with plates, so as to insure a uniform description of the complexion, hair, and eyes.

On comparative anthropology we expect the sixth part of *Crania Britannica* of Drs. Davis and Thurnam, and Mr. Busk's work on *Crania Typica*. Mr. J. W. Jackson also announces a volume of *Lectures*; and we may also expect some contribution from Professor Huxley on the subject of comparative anthropology, on which he has recently delivered lectures before the Royal College of Surgeons and at the School of Mines. I understand that Mr. Luke Burke also meditates giving his present views on this subject. There is also announced a translation of the second volume of Mr. Collingwood's edition of Waitz's *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, with copious notes and a preface by Captain Burton; and a translation by Mr. Alfred Higgins of Retzius's works on comparative anthropology. We also hope ere long to have a valuable contribution to this subject from our accomplished Fellow, Dr. Barnard Davis.

I have already trespassed so much on your patience that I have now no time to dwell on the important labours of our fellow anthropological students in other parts of the world. Our science has sustained a heavy loss in the death of our Honorary Fellows, Rudolph Wagner and Theodor Waitz: to the memory of both due justice will be done on another occasion. We ought to be encouraged in our work by the knowledge that both of these hard working anthropologists looked on the formation of our Society with the greatest interest. Rudolph Wagner most generously admitted that we had done for England what he and his associates had failed to do for Germany. He had promised, too, to contribute to our publications, and thus to show, by his example, that he was anxious to help forward the great work in which we are engaged.

My respected colleague, Mr. Collingwood, is preparing an obituary of Theodor Waitz; it, therefore, would ill become me to anticipate what he will have to say; but, from a lengthened correspondence of several years past, I know that he looked to England for the information necessary for the future development of anthropological science.

Gentlemen, great things are expected of us from our scientific brethren on the continent, owing to the unusual opportunities which we enjoy for prosecuting our science. I fear we may not be able to realise all these expectations, but let us all do our best, and all work to aid the development of the Society, either by contributing papers, or by making others interested in our work, and thus increase our numbers and resources.

I have consented to allow myself to be again nominated for the important office of President, in the hope that during the next year we may increase our members from four hundred and fifty to double that number. I shall then be able to resign to other hands the conduct

of a Society which could only then be ruined by prostituting the objects contemplated in its formation, viz., the establishment of a reliable SCIENCE OF MANKIND.

Mr. BOLLAERT moved—"That the thanks of the Society be given to the President for his address, and that it be printed." His task, he said, was very brief. The President had, in a discourse replete with the most exhaustive information, and indicating his profound study of the subject, pointed out the relations between the science of anthropology, ethnography, and ethnology. In his own researches in South America, many years ago, he had been much hampered by the terms used by various authors. If he had then possessed such lucid definitions as had that day been laid before them, he would have been placed on the proper track for future investigations. He would not expatiate on the great interest which Dr. Hunt took in our science, and the constant hard work he brought to bear on every possible matter connected with the Society.

Mr. REDDIE, while heartily seconding the motion, said that there were errors both of omission and of commission in the President's address. The error of commission of which he had most to complain was the fact that the President had used expressions respecting himself and his own labours, in which no member would agree with him. The tone of opinion on the continent respecting our Society was most favourable; and he thought the President had shown great modesty in forbearing to allude to his own labours, by which this success had been achieved, and which had so much tended to advance the interests both of science and of the Society. He had also omitted to mention the fact that the majority of the books in the Library had been presented by Dr. Hunt himself. When the whole of Dr. Hunt's address should be printed, he hoped that the facts therein published, relative to the respective merits of the words Anthropology and Ethnology, as well as to the reciprocal position of the Ethnological and Anthropological Societies, would amply justify the decision which had been arrived at, to reject the absurd terms which were proposed by the Ethnological delegates, and to lead Fellows of the Society never again to attempt to waste their time by philandering with our sister with the pretty name!

Carried unanimously.

The PRESIDENT then moved the following resolution—"That this meeting is of opinion that it would be advantageous to the interests of anthropological science, that a special section should be formed in the British Association, to be devoted especially to anthropology; and that an address to the President and Council of the British Association be prepared, embodying the substance of the resolution."

Mr. BOLLAERT begged to second the resolution. He hoped the members of the British Association who originally opposed the Society would soon see the error of their ways, and give to it that support and assistance for which its important objects and powerful numbers qualified it.

Mr. REDDIE thought it might be possible to adopt a middle

course. It was undoubtedly a great triumph for Mr. Carter Blake after the Newcastle meeting, to be able to tell the Society in his report that all the original papers proceeded from the anthropologists, whilst the ethnologists had nothing to employ the time of the Section, but stale papers previously read in London; and he thought that the same plan might be adopted again, and the anthropological papers containing sound science might be offered to Section E, and, if refused, be read at our own meetings in London.

Mr. CARTER BLAKE said that papers which treated on any purely scientific topic had the greatest difficulty in being received for reading in Section E. Those papers which were not likely to please the ladies who attended the section in such large numbers were rejected, and anything which would create popular amusement was selected to their prejudice. The most valuable papers were also sent from post to pillar in a highly ludicrous manner. He recollected at Newcastle a paper on some human remains from St. Acheul being sent backwards and forwards from Section C (Geology) to Section E (Geography and Ethnology), the secretaries of the former section stating that the remains belonged to so recent a period that they could not be considered as prehistoric, and the secretaries of the latter section alleging the reverse. It was merely by accident that the paper was read at all. This was what might be expected to be repeated at every meeting until they had a separate section for anthropology alone.

The motion was put to the meeting and carried unanimously.

The Scrutineers brought up their report, when it was announced that the following gentlemen were elected for 1865:

*President*—Dr. James Hunt. *Vice-Presidents*—Captain R. F. Burton; J. Frederick Collingwood, Esq.; Dr. Berthold Seemann; T. Bendyshe, Esq. *Secretaries*—George E. Roberts, Esq.; W. Bollaert, Esq. *Foreign Secretary*—A. Higgins, Esq. *Treasurer*—Dr. R. S. Charnock. *Council*—H. J. C. Beavan, Esq.; C. H. Chambers, Esq.; S. E. Collingwood, Esq.; Dr. George D. Gibb; the Viscount Milton; George North, Esq.; L. Owen Pike, Esq.; S. E. Bouverie-Pusey, Esq.; W. Winwood Reade, Esq.; James Reddie, Esq.; G. F. Rolph, Esq.; C. R. des Ruffières, Esq.; W. Travers, Esq.; W. S. W. Vaux, Esq.

Resolved, on the motion of Mr. M'CLELLAND, seconded by Dr. CHARNOCK,—“That the thanks of the Society be given to the Scrutineers.”

The President then declared the proceedings at an end.